

REMARKS

In response to the Appeal Brief previously filed by Applicant on October 22, 2008, the Examiner reopened prosecution of the presently pending patent application and issued a Final Office Action mailed on April 21, 2009 ("Final Office Action") in which claims 23-27 and 50 were indicated as being in condition for allowance. Further, in view of the Examiner's statements in the Final Office Action, it was Applicant's understanding that the allowance of claims 23-27 and 50 over the prior art of record was based at least partially upon the recited features of independent claims 23 and 50 pertaining to a dual-port register file having a first port for transferring data between the register file and a row of a memory array and a second port for transferring data between the register file and a functional unit. *See* Final Office Action, page 46 (noting the Examiner's comments in paragraph 56).

After carefully considering the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in the Final Office Action, Applicant filed an amendment and response ("Response") on March 23, 2009 in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, Applicant canceled claims 1-14, 46-47, 49, and 51, and further amended independent claims 16, 28, and 45 to include the above-discussed dual-port register file feature.¹ Applicant strongly believed that these amendments would place all pending claims in condition for allowance.

In the Advisory Action mailed on April 10, 2009 ("Advisory Action"), the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-14, 16-22, 28-32, 34-47, 49, and 51 and indicated that the amendments submitted by the Response filed on March 23, 2009 were not entered.² While the Examiner acknowledged that the amendments to independent claims 16, 28, and 45 generally incorporate that dual-port register feature recited by allowable independent claims 23 and 50, the

¹ Claims 15, 33, and 48 were previously canceled and remain canceled by this Response.

² In the Advisory Action, the Examiner concurrently stated that independent claim 50 was in condition for allowance and that the rejection of claims 49-51 was maintained. Based upon this discrepancy, Applicant's assume that this is merely a typographical error, and that the Examiner intended to maintain the rejection of claims 49 and 51, rather than claims 49 through 51.

Examiner stated that the particular combination of features recited by the amended independent claims 16, 28, or 45 would require further search and consideration.

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's reasons for maintaining the rejections of claims 1-14, 16-22, 28-32, 34-47, 49, and 51 or with the Examiner's assertion that the previously submitted amendments would require further search and consideration, Applicant has chosen to place the present application in condition for allowance by canceling the presently rejected claims. Accordingly, by the present Supplemental Response, claims 1-14, 16-22, 28-32, 34-47, 49, and 51 are canceled, thereby leaving only allowable claims 23-27 and 50 pending. In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. Further, it should be understood that claims 1-14, 16-22, 28-32, 34-47, 49, and 51 are being canceled without prejudice and that Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject recited by these claims (in either their current or previous forms) in a future continuation patent application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Although the previously submitted amendments with regard to independent claim 16 were not entered, as discussed above, the Examiner indicated in the Advisory Action that had the amendments been entered, independent claim 16 would be rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, due to lack of antecedent basis with regard to certain recited features. The Examiner also appeared to indicate that certain additional features recited by previously pending claims 20 and 21, each of which depend from claim 16 either directly or by way of an intervening claim, lack antecedent basis.³ Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection and/or objections to these claims, it is respectfully noted that each of these claims have been canceled by the present Supplemental Response. As such, any rejections or objections with regard to claims 16, 20, or 21 are believed to be moot.

³ It is unclear from the Advisory Action whether the Examiner intended to reject or object to claims 20 and 21. See Advisory Action, page 2.

General Authorization for Extensions of Time and Payment of Fees

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, Applicant hereby provides a general authorization to treat this and any future reply requiring an extension of time as incorporating a request therefore. Further, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any other fees that may be due at this time or at any time during the pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 06-1315; Order No. MICS:0171-2/MAN.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2009

/Robert A. Manware/
Robert A. Manware
Reg. No. 48,758
FLETCHER YODER
PO Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545